



Signature _____

Claims 8, 11-12, 21, 24, 25, 30-34, and 40 were discussed. The examiner agreed that cited prior art in the case (including Fujita et al. (US Patent No. 4,774,399), Inazaki et al. (JP403083480) and Bleier (US Patent No. 6,382,508), among others) did not teach at least a device receiver having a portion external to the housing being configured to enable a restraint to engage an opening in the device. The Examiner also pointed out what he believed to be informalities in claims 12, 21, 31-34, and 40 and provided suggestions to overcome the informalities. Applicant's representative noted he would address the Examiner's concerns in the next Office Action response.

No fees are believed due with this interview summary. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505\5681-03900\BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8800
Date: July 6, 2004